

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 13-14 have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.175(c) as allegedly being improper multiple dependent claims.

Claim 13 has been amended to include the decompression apparatus of claims 9 and 10. With respect to claim 14, claim 14 has been amended to depend from claim 13 and to recite the image display apparatus in claim 12.

Applicants submit that claims 13 and 14 are properly dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Claim 5 has been objected to on the Office Action summary sheet, but the Examiner has not provided any reasons for his objection. It appears that the Examiner is objecting to claim 5 because claim 5 is directed to “an image display method,” but depends from a claim to “an image data decompression method.”

Claim 5 has been amended to recite the image data decompression method of claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objection.

Claims 15-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 15-19 have been amended to recite the computer readable program means. Applicants submit that the claims are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the computer readable means is functional descriptive material and the computer

Appln. No.: 09/939,693
Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

program is being claimed in a process where the computer is executing the computer program's instructions. *See* MPEP 2106. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 9-10, 12 and 15-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Asai et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,841,935 ("Asai").

Independent claims 1, 6 and 15 are directed to "adding new compression information regarding new compression processing." The Examiner asserts that Asai discloses adding new compression information regarding new compression processing citing col. 5, lines 45-58. However, Asai discloses extracting the CF (color frame) information signal and then adding it back to the compressed data. In Asai, the CF information is used as a means of providing concurrent indexing of 2 characteristics of frame information, i.e. position and I. B coding. Therefore, Applicants submit that in Asai the CF information being added is not new information. Thus, the CF information in Asai is not new compression information or new compression data regarding new compression processing as in Applicants' independent claims 1, 6 and 15 (see Fig. 2, and col. 5, lines 25-28, col. 5, lines 39-44). Therefore, Applicants submit that Asai does not disclose or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 6 and 15.

Additionally, the Examiner cites to col. 5, lines 59-67 and col. 6, lines 1-5 as allegedly disclosing controlling the degree of compression of the image data based on the compression information. However, in the portion cited by the Examiner, the reference discloses that the error correction part corrects errors in the read data (col. 5, lines 59-61). On the contrary, Applicants' claimed invention supplies a warning when the image quality is degraded (page 6, lines 12-14 of Applicants' specification). Moreover, in Asai, after the error is detected, the CF

information is extracted and delayed, while the MPEG decoder decompresses the data, and then the CF information is added back (col. 5, line 61 to col. 6, line 16). Thus, the CF information in Asai is not new compression information and the CF information does not pertain to controlling the degree of compression. Therefore, Applicants submit that Asai does not disclose or suggest controlling the degree of compression of the image data based on the new compression information as in Applicants' dependent claims 2, 7, and 16.

With respect to claims 9 and 10, the Examiner cites col. 6, lines 15-25 as allegedly disclosing a decompression means for decompressing the compressed image data, based on the compression information. However, in the portion cited by the Examiner, the reference discloses coding a NTSC signal according to the GOP sequence on the basis of the extracted CF information signal (col. 6, lines 20-25). That is, the GOP coding sequence is correlated to the CF information that is previously extracted. However, this does not relate to decompressing the compressed image data based on the new compression information as in Applicants' dependent claims 9 and 10. Therefore, Applicants submit that Asai does not disclose or suggest decompressing the compressed image data based on the compression information as in Applicants' dependent claims 9 and 10.

With respect to claim 12, the Examiner cites col. 6, lines 15-17 as allegedly displaying the compression information together with an image represented by the decompressed image data. However, the portion referred to by the Examiner merely states that the SDI signal is converted to a NTSC composite signal. Further, Asai discloses that the sequence information is outputted to the reproduced image data in the form of the CF information in the video index (col.

Appln. No.: 09/939,693
Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

6, lines 23-25). Applicants' claim 12 is directed to displaying the compression information together with an image represented by the decompressed image data.

Further, because claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 16 depend from independent claims 1, 6 and 15, which we do not believe to be anticipated or obvious over Asai, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the presently claimed invention is not anticipated or obvious over Asai. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

Claims 3-4, 8, 11 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

As stated above, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 5, 6 and 15 are not anticipated or obvious over Asai. Additionally, claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 16 are at least patentable by virtue of their dependency. Therefore, claims 3-4, 8, 11 and 17 are not dependent on a rejected base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Appln. No.: 09/939,693
Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 23, 2004


Jennifer R. Leach
Registration No. 54,257